## 2012 Macomb County NSP/HOME RFP Review/Rating Criteria

1.	Consistency w/RFP & Acceptability:	No Points - completeness review	
2)	Proposal is consistent with the RFP	Yes	No
a) b)	Proposal describes project components.	Yes	No
	Proposal located in an eligible community.	Yes	No
c)			-
d)	Proposal is eligible and meets RFP objective.	Yes	No
e)	Proposal sets habitability standard.	Yes	No
f)	Project meets income eligibility requirements.	Yes	No
g)	Proposal clearly establishes homeownership affordability.	Yes	No
h)	Proposal demonstrates affordable rent/utilities (schedules).	Yes	No
i)	Developer or other partners are not debarred or suspended.	Yes	No
	Any "No" answer means rejection with no further consideration	n. Comment a	as necessary:
2.	Capacity: Respondent		70 Pts. Possible
۵)	knows HOME NSD and other Federal requirements	Voc	No
a)	knows HOME, NSP, and other Federal requirements.	Yes	No No
b)	has a capable development and management team.	Yes	No
c)	has a successful history w/similar projects to proposal.	Yes	No
d)	can start project within 3 months of approval.	Yes	No
e)	can draw down 50% of funds by March 10, 2013.	Yes	No
f)	can complete the project by February 15, 2014.	Yes	No
g)	has large amounts of unspent grant funds, but has specific pl	ans	
	for using them. (explain)	Yes	No
	Score: Comment as necessary:		
3.	Feasibility		45 Points Possible
a)	The development pro forma shows all necessary costs.	Yes	No
b)	The cost projections are reasonable and realistic.	Yes	No
c)	The operational pro forma is realistic and establishes sustainated and realistic.		110
C)	(Affects rental proposals but is scoring-neutral-owner / renter.		No
٩)	A 66	Yes	No
d)	Anordability requirement acknowledged and guaranteed.	162	NO
	Score: Comment as necessary:		
4.	Cost:		20 Points Possible
a)	Cost per housing unit produced is < \$ 90,000	Yes	No
b)	Cost per housing unit produced is < \$105,000	Yes	No
c)	Cost per housing unit produced is < \$120,000	Yes	No
d)	Cost per housing unit produced is < \$150,000	Yes	No
e)	Cost per housing unit produced is ≥ \$150,000	Yes	No
,	Score: Comment as Necessary.		

5.	npact: Total # units, # LI units, # VLI units		25 Points Possible	
	# LI / total =%			
,	Project is 100% LI eligible, or Project < 100% LI eligible but program requirements met.	Yes Yes	No No	<u>and</u>
d)	Project > 25% < 50% VLI eligible, or Project > 50% VLI eligible, or Project > 75% VLI eligible.	Yes Yes Yes	No No No	
	Score: Comment as Necessary.			
6.	Match and Leverage: (Leveraged requires firm commitment)		30 Points Po	essible
	Proposal generates no Match Proposal generates < 1:4 match ratio (non-Federal to Federal). Proposal generates > 1.4 match ratio (non-Federal to Federal).	Yes Yes Yes	No. No. No	and
	Respondent's investment > 10% total development cost. Respondent's investment > 25% total development cost. Respondent's Investment > 35% total development cost. Respondent's investment > 50% total development cost.	Yes Yes Yes Yes	No No No No	
	Score: Comment as necessary.			
7.	Project extends/completes current County affordable hsg. initiative  Score: Provide rationale for scoring decision.	Yes	15 Points Po No	essible
То	tal Score: of 205 possible.			
Re	commendation:			
	Reviewed by: Date: _			